UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/801,845	03/16/2004	Marcee Burns	030828 (BLL0179US)	3111

36192   7590   03/16/2010

AT&T Legal Department - CC
Attn: Patent Docketing
Room 2A-207
One AT&T Way
Bedminster, NJ 07921

EXAMINER
LAN, TZU-HSIANG

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3623	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/16/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _14 December 2009_.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) _1-20_ is/are pending in the application.
     4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) _1-20_ is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
     a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
        1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
        2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
        3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)
1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date _2/26/2010_.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Introduction

The following is a Final office action in response to the communications received on December 14, 2009. Claims 1-20 are now pending in this application.

Response to Amendment

As for claims 1-4, the previous 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection is withdrawn in light of applicant's amendment.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 6/16/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that the combination of Rosenzweig, Smith and Barton fail to teach a report include a timeliness driver that includes a turnaround time and an advance notice interval. Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Here, Barton discloses:

report includes a cost driver and a timeliness driver (Fig 14-15d i.e. cost for a task and associated time to finish a task), wherein timeliness deriver includes:

a turnaround time operable for identifying a total time expended between transmitting a general request and receiving a detailed response to said general request (fig 13-14 i.e. difference between invoice date and picked-up time corresponds to the turnaround time);

an advance notice interval operable for identify an average advance notice given to at least one of a provider to initiate an activity (figure 15 of Barton shows that a user may create custom report base on his or her need. Since Barton's disclosure is related to shipment delivery, advance notice interval can be determined by the time difference between the invoice date and system contact time with a specific shipping company).

While citations are provided for the data implemented in the report, examiner notes that the report content and the report type are merely descriptive materials because the claimed functionality of what is done with the data is the same. i.e., the

recited method steps would compile report with same mechanism regardless of the specific report data. Further, the structural elements remain the same regardless of the specific data. Thus, these descriptive materials will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, *see In re Gulack, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); In re Lowry, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994); MPEP ' 2106*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Rosenzweig with Smith and Barton because all three prior arts are analogous for discussing different aspect of reporting function relating to a reporting system. Moreover, it would be obvious to modify Rosenzweig with Smith because having a reporting system able to retrieve data and compiling report based on said data would facilitate operation effectiveness by reducing manual data transfer. Further, it would be obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Rosenzweig and Smith with Barton because including cost and timeliness driver in the report because it would allow report requestor to sort through content of interest effectively. Since claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

In response to applicant's argument that the combination of Rosenzweig, Smith and Barton fail to teach a telecommunication equipment order preparation report include

overall percentage of projects containing appendices that are billable by vendor during a period of time for review. Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Here, "telecommunication equipment order preparation report" is merely a descriptive material label for "a report"; as noted above descriptive material does not distinguish the claim invention from prior arts in terms of patentability. Fig 15 of Barton showed a report that include overall percentage of projects containing appendices that are billable by vendor during a period of time for review (i.e. 15b shows a report during a period of time for review [1-jan-99 to 31-jan-99] with total of 20 rows but only 15 rows have billable appendices; therefore overall percentage of project containing billable appendices is 75%).

It would be obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Rosenzweig and Smith with Barton because claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

In response to applicant's argument that the combination of Rosenzweig, Smith and Barton fail to teach storing a template in a dynamic template database. Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Here, Rosenzweig teaches storing template in a dynamic template database (fig 4 and col.5:43-6:4).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 1, **3-5, 7-10, 13-17, and 20** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over US patent 6081810 to Rosenzweig et al. (**"Rosenzweig"**) in view of

US patent application 2002/0147668 to Smith et al. ("**Smith**") further in view of US

patent 7430517 to **Barton**.

  As to claim 1, Rosenzweig discloses the claimed invention substantially

including a computer-implemented method for providing web-based reporting services

to a business (col. 4 lines 32-34) entity, said web-based services implemented on a host

system (fig 3), the method comprising:

  providing a user interface to a client system in response to a request for a

report (col. 4 line 28 – col. 5 line 15 i.e. browser with user interface), **said report**

specifying a report type (col. 3 lines 1-24 i.e. every report associate with a report

type);

  providing a requester with a template only if said requester is authorized to

receive said report (col. 4 lines 38-60 user interface for requesting report corresponds

to template);

prompting said requester to enter request data in said template (col. 6 lines

5-36 i.e. report type, date, and possibly a segment which requester wishes to view);

upon receiving said request data, searching a database for a dataset

corresponding to said request data (col. 5 lines 5-14 receiving request data such as

vender index, then search database for data set corresponding to said request);

if said dataset is found, retrieving at least one order from said database in

accordance with a report type requested (Fig. 1 i.e. an order from a specific vendor

is retrieved from data base accordance with a report type account payable); and

making said report available to said requester over a web-based network

(col. 6 lines 5-14 and col. 6 lines 5-36);

wherein said report type comprises at least one of: a cost report (Fig. 1);

and a custom search report (Fig 1, and col. 6 lines 5-36). Since applicant used the

language "at least one of," teaching of one report will be sufficient to address this

limitation.

While Rosenzweig discloses all the limitations above, Rosenzweig fail to

explicitly discloses the following limitations, however,

Smith discloses:

Retrieving budget data related to said at least one order (Smith, Fig 5a-5f, ¶ 46-

47, and ¶ 59-63); and

Compiling a report on said host system using said at least one order and said

budget data (Smith, Fig 5a-5f, ¶ 46-47, and ¶ 59-63).

Barton discloses:

report includes a cost driver and a timeliness driver (Fig 14-15d i.e. cost for a task and associated time to finish a task), wherein timeliness deriver includes:

a turnaround time operable for identifying a total time expended between transmitting a general request and receiving a detailed response to said general request (fig 13-14 i.e. difference between invoice date and picked-up time corresponds to the turnaround time);

an advance notice interval operable for identify an average advance notice given to at least one of a provider to initiate an activity (figure 15 of Barton shows that a user may create custom report base on his or her need. Since Barton's disclosure is related to shipment delivery, advance notice interval can be determined by the time difference between the invoice date and system contact time with a specific shipping company).

generate a timeliness report (fig 15), an equipment order preparation report (fig 10-15 i.e. equipment deliver preparation report), and a driver report (fig 10-15 i.e. time driver report by delivery time)

While citations are provided for the report content, examiner note that the report content and the report type will be considered as descriptive material because the claimed functionality of what is done with the data is the same. I.e., the recited method steps would be performed the same regardless of the specific report data. Further, the structural elements remain the same regardless of the specific data. Thus, these descriptive materials will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, *see In re Gulack, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); In re Lowry, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994); MPEP ' 2106*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Rosenzweig with Smith and Barton because all three prior arts are analogous for discussing different aspect of reporting function relating to a reporting system. Moreover, it would be obvious to modify Rosenzweig with Smith because having a reporting system able to retrieve data and compiling report based on said data would facilitate operation effectiveness by reducing manual data transfer. Further, it would be obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Rosenzweig and Smith with Barton because including cost and timeliness driver in the report because it would allow report requestor to sort through content of interest effectively. Since claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

Although Rosenzweig, Smith and Barton disclose all the limitations above, they fail to explicitly teach following limitations, however, <u>official notice was previously taken, now consider as admitted prior art</u> that "returning error message when dataset is not found" is old and well known at the time of invention for a system to return an error message when certain dataset is missing or can not be retrieved.

As to claim 3, see the discussion in claim 1 above. Rosenzweig, Smith and

Barton further disclose:

in-place cost factors operable for identifying a total cost for an order or project

including any labor costs, said total cost relating to standard activities performed by, and

on behalf of, an enterprise (Smith, Fig 5a-5f, ¶ 46-47, and ¶ 59-63 i.e. labor cost and

material cost);

custom detail costs operable for identifying expenditures that relate to non-

standard activities performed by, and on behalf of, said enterprise (Smith, Fig 5a-5f, ¶

46-47, and ¶ 59-63 i.e. permit cost); and

miscellaneous costs operable for identifying costs that are not related to said in-

place cost factors and said custom detail costs (Smith, Fig 5a-5f, ¶ 46-47, and ¶ 59-63

i.e. subcontractor cost).

In-place cost factor, custom detail costs, and miscellaneous cost are cost

allocation based on enterprise management's discretion. In the example provided by

Smith, examiner interprets labor and material cost as in-place cost relating to standard

activities performed by an enterprise; permit cost is interpreted as non-standard

activities performed by said enterprise; and subcontractor cost is interpreted as no

related to in-place cost and custom detail cost. However, one with ordinary skill in the

art at the time of the invention would be able to allocate cost differently if one so desires

to do so, because cost categorization is well known in the art at the time of the

invention.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify Rosenzweig and Barton with Smith since claimed invention is

merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely

would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in

the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

As to claim 4, see the discussion in claim 1 above. Rosenzweig, Smith and

Barton further disclose:

a completion date met operable for identifying timeliness of completion of

activities performed (Barton, Fig 14 – 15d, i.e. delivered date for task completion).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify Rosenzweig, Smith, with Barton because incorporating a completion

date would provide more detailed information for tracking contractor's performance;

hence, assist future contractor selection for the enterprise.

As to claim 5, Rosenzweig, Smith and Barton disclose the claimed invention

substantially. All the limitations of claim 5 are of the same scope as the limitations of

claim 1, and are therefore rejected on the same basis, with following noted exceptions.

Claim 5 recites a storage medium encoded with machine-readable computer program

code to carry out method steps of claim 1. ¶ 35-39 of Smith discloses a computer

readable medium such as CD-Rom or RAM capable of storing instruction of claim 1 and

carry out method steps of claim 1 when executed by a computer.

As to claim 7, see the discussion in claim 5 above. All the limitations of claim 7 are of the same scope as the limitations of claim 3, and are therefore rejected on the same basis.

As to claim 8, see the discussion in claim 5 above. All the limitations of claim 8 are of the same scope as the limitations of claim 4, and are therefore rejected on the same basis.

As to claim 9, Rosenzweig, Smith and Barton disclose the claimed invention substantially. All the limitations of claim 9 are of the same scope as the limitations of claim 1, and are therefore rejected on the same basis, with following noted exceptions. Claim 9 recite a system for providing web-based reporting services to a telecommunications entity, comprising:

A computer processing device in communication with at least one client system via communications network, said computer processing device including a server and a data repository storing databases of budget data and order data;

wherein said server executes web server software, a budget tool, and an ordering tool;

a user interface accessible to said at least one client system, said user interface including templates operable for entering report request data by a user of said at least one client system.

Rosenzweig, Smith and Barton further disclose a system for providing web-based reporting services to a telecommunication entity (col. 4 lines 32-34 i.e. business entity) comprising:

a computer processing device in communication with at least one client system via communications network, said computer processing device including a server and a data repository storing databases of budget data and order data (Rosenzweig, fig 3-4, col. 4 lines 28-40 shows computer processing device, and Figure 1 shows data includes budget and order data);

wherein said server executes web server software, a budget tool, and an ordering tool (Smith, ¶ 39-45, and Fig 1b-5a);

a user interface accessible to said at least one client system (col. 4 line 28 – col. 5 line 15 i.e. browser with user interface. Client system show in Fig 3-4), **said user interface including templates operable for entering report request data by a user of said at least one client system** (Rosenzweig, col. 4 lines 38-60 i.e. user interface for requesting report corresponds to template or Barton, Fig 15-16).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Rosenzweig with Smith and Barton since claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements for operating a reporting system, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

      As to claim 10, see the discussion in claim 9 above. All the limitations of claim 10 are of the same scope as the limitations of claim 1, and are therefore rejected on the same basis.

      As to claim 13, see the discussion in claim 9 above. All the limitations of claim 13 are of the same scope as the limitations of claim 4, and are therefore rejected on the same basis.

      As to claim 14, see the discussion in claim 10 above. Rosenzweig, Smith and Barton further disclose:

      A summary cost report including an average and total for all field selected in said report request (Barton, Fig 15B); and

      A detail cost report including a line-by-line itemization for reach project for all fields selected in the report request (Barton, Fig 15B).

      It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Rosenzweig and Smith with Barton since claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

As to claim 15, see the discussion in claim 14 above. All the limitations of claim 15 are of the same scope as the limitations of claim 3, and are therefore rejected on the same basis.

As to claim 16, see the discussion in claim 10 above. Rosenzweig, Smith and Barton further disclose an equipment ordering report (Fig 15a-15d i.e. shipment for equipment) incorporating projects or orders containing appendices that are billable by vendor during a period of time for review (Barton, Fig 15A -15B).

Rosenzweig, Smith and Barton do not disclose an overall percentage of projects contain appendices. However, an official notice was previously taken, now consider as admitted prior art that it was old and well known at the time of the invention to derive a percentage of projects from a total project by dividing project with appendices over total number of projects. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate an overall percentage of project contain appendices to facilitate monitoring of projects in relationship with equipment orders.

Although Rosenzweig, Smith and Barton do not explicitly disclose that ordering report is specific towards telecommunication equipment, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply this feature in telecommunication equipment order because in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

As to claim 17, see the discussion in claim 16 above. Rosenzweig, Smith and Barton further disclose that equipment order preparation report further includes field of data including:

a state (Barton, Fig 15B); and

an order count (Barton, Fig 15B i.e. total number of BOL#);

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Rosenzweig and Smith with Barton since claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

As to claim 20, see the discussion in claim 1 above. Rosenzweig further teaches storing template in a dynamic template database (fig 4 and col.5:43-6:4).

Claim 2, 6, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US

(**"Rosenzweig"**) in view of ("**Smith**"), in view of **Barton** and further in view of US patent

publication 20040073434 to Volquardsen et al. ("**Volquardsen**")

  As to claim 2, see the discussion in claim 1 above. Rosenzweig, Smith, and

Barton do not explicitly disclose associating model data with order and budget report.

Volquardsen discloses:

  Retrieving model-based ordering system data and compiling a report using

model-based order system data with at least one order and said budget (Fig 18b-20 i.e.

parts number correspond to model data, and each model order has a listing price

corresponds to budget, and an order).

  It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify Rosenzweig, Smith, and Barton with Volquardsen because

incorporating model data with budget and order information would provide more detailed

expense report for company's budget analysis.

  As to claim 6, see the discussion in claim 5 above. All the limitations of claim 6

are of the same scope as the limitations of claim 2, and are therefore rejected on the

same basis.

  As to claim 11, see the discussion in claim 9 above. All the limitations of claim

11 are of the same scope as the limitations of claim 2, and are therefore rejected on the

same basis, with following noted exceptions. Claim 11 recites model-based ordering

system data stored in said data repository; wherein said report type is model report.

Volquardsen further disclose:

Model-based ordering system data stored in data repository (Fig 1b, ¶ 74-77);

Wherein said report type is model report (Fig 20).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify Rosenzweig, Smith, and Barton with Volquardsen since claimed

invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element

merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of

ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were

predictable.

Claims 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US patent

6081810 to Rosenzweig et al. (**"Rosenzweig"**) in view of US patent publication

2002/0147668 to Smith et al. ("**Smith**"), in view of US patent 7430517 to **Barton** and

further in view of US patent publication 20040186763 to Charles Smith. ("**Charles**")

As to claim 12, see the discussion in claim 10 above. Rosenzweig, Smith and

Barton further disclose that timeliness report includes information relating to overall

ordering that transpire between an enterprise and its vendors and contractors

(Rosenzweig, Figure 1).

However, Rosenzweig, Smith, and Barton do not disclose that timeliness report

includes engineering and install process information.

Charles discloses:

Incorporating engineering (Fig 10, procedure column, such as switchgear

transfer) and install process (Fig 10; job status complete or in process) with ordering

(Fig 10, job No.) that transpire between an enterprise and its vendors and contractors

(Fig 10, multiple clients).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify Rosenzweig, Smith, and Barton with Charles because additional

information presents more comprehensive report for the enterprise evaluation.

Claim 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US patent

6081810 to Rosenzweig et al. ("**Rosenzweig**") in view of US patent publication

2002/0147668 to Smith et al. ("Smith"), in view of US patent 7430517 to **Barton**, in

view of US patent 5799286 to Morgan et al. ("**Morgan**")

As to claim 18, see the discussion in claim 10 above. Rosenzweig, Smith, and

Barton do not explicitly show a driver type report. However, Morgan discloses driver

type report (Fig 18A-18B) including:

remote terminals (Morgan, fig. 11 and col.6:37-53 i.e. site attribute data include a

variety of site-specific information).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify Rosenzweig, Smith, and Barton with Morgan since claimed invention

is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely

would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in

the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

As to claim 19, see the discussion in claim 18 above. Rosenzweig, Smith,

Barton, and Morgan further disclose that said driver report includes:

an overall driver summary report providing aggregated total model usage and

related dollar expenditures for a respective driver (Morgan, Figure 18A-B and Table J

i.e. total model usage equal to over all equipment usage); and

showing report during a requested period of time (Barton, Figure 15)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to combined overall driver summary report disclosed by Morgan with showing

of requested time period disclosed by Barton and derive the claimed limitation since

claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each

element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one

of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination

were predictable.

Conclusion

1.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to TZU-HSIANG (SEAN) LAN whose telephone number is

(571)270-7054. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8am-4pm

EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Beth V. Boswell can be reached on (571)272-6737. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/TZU-HSIANG (SEAN) LAN/
Examiner, Art Unit 3623

/Beth V. Boswell/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3623